



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/945,200

08/30/2001

Martin Morris

WIDC-008/00US

4498

23446

7590

12/02/2005

MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD  
500 WEST MADISON STREET  
SUITE 3400  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

BURD, KEVIN MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2631

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,200

Applicant(s)

MORRIS, MARTIN

Examiner

Kevin M. Burd

Art Unit

2631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/21/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-15,17-21 and 24-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-15,17-21 and 24-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2631

1. This office action, in response to the amendment filed 9/21/2005, is a final office action.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The objection to claim 1 has been withdrawn.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 9/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant states Haartsen (US 2002/0187799); Ho (US 2002/0034172) and the instant application's disclosed prior art teaches away from the claimed invention. The examiner disagrees. MPEP 2141.02 [R-3] heading IV states: "the prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed...." In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The combination disclosed in the previous office action teaches the claimed invention.
5. Applicant states, it is not necessary for Haartsen to notify a wireless communication device of an increase level of error correction, However, Haarsten discloses the information containing the desired coding rate may be transmitted to the transmitter section of the radio transceiver in communication with transceiver 300 to

Art Unit: 2631

allow the transmitter to modify its coding rate  $r$  in paragraph 0065. This information will communicate any change in the error correction coding.

6. Applicant submits that just because DIACs tolerate a higher bit error rate than a body of a message does not suggest reserving an access portion to notify a second communication device that the outgoing transmissions have an increased level of error correction coding. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Error correction is critical in the recovery of data. When large amounts of errors occur, error correction must be improved to continue to recover data correctly. When errors are occurring, the command to increase error correction must be received. The DIAC allows this information to be detected beyond a range at which a Bluetooth transmission would normally be corrupted (instant application's disclosed prior art paragraph 1027). By transmitting the information in the DIAC, the command to increase error correction coding will be received correctly to allow the data to then be received correctly.

7. Applicant submits there is not teaching of reserving an access portion to notify of an increased level of error correction coding. The examiner disagrees. The combination

Art Unit: 2631

of Haartsen, Ho and the instant application's disclosed prior art disclosed this feature. As stated in the previous office action, Haarsten discloses transmitting the describe link adaptation scheme of altering the coding rate may be used to automatically adjust communication link parameters to provide a desired range (paragraph 0058). Haarsten further discloses the information containing the desired coding rate may be transmitted to the transmitter section of the radio transceiver in communication with transceiver 300 to allow the transmitter to modify its coding rate  $r$  in paragraph 0065. Ho discloses reserving a portion of the transmission to convey this information and the instant's disclosed prior art discloses the DIAC and the advantages of transmitting the error correction coding information in this section of the transmission.

8. Applicant submits the combination does not teach appending to a beginning portion of an access code a dedicated inquiry access code as set forth in claim 21. The examiner disagrees. Figure 3a of the disclosed prior art teaches the access code in the beginning of the transmission. The DIAC will be a component of the access code.

For these reasons and the reasons stated in the previous office action, this office action is made final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-21 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen (US 2002/0187799) in view of Ho (US 2002/0034172) further in view of the instant application's disclosed prior art.

Regarding claims 1, 8, 12, 17, 18, 21, 27, 30, 32 and 33, Haartsen discloses a wireless communication device and method of using a wireless communication device (abstract). A receiver is operable to receive an incoming transmission (paragraph 0064). A transmitter is operable to send an outgoing transmission over a first range (paragraph 0063). An error correction coding circuit is provided to vary the level of the error correction coding applied to the data within the outgoing transmission (paragraphs 0061 and 0063). The describe link adaptation scheme of altering the coding rate may be used to automatically adjust communication link parameters to provide a desired range (paragraph 0058).

Haartsen does not disclose a portion of the outgoing transmission is reserved to notify a second wireless device of a change in the level of error correction coding. Ho discloses, in figure 1B, a FEC value 114 is transmitted and provides information on the forward error correction scheme (paragraphs 0086 and 0093). This allows the second wireless device to know the level of coding for the FEC fields 310 and 412 (paragraph 0093) and allows the error correction to begin immediately. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ho into the wireless method and device of Haartsen for the reason stated above.

The combination of Haartsen and Ho do not disclose the reserved portion of the transmission is found in a dedicated inquiry access codes (DIAC). The instant

Art Unit: 2631

application's disclosed prior art states according to the Bluetooth specification, DIACs are specifically chosen to tolerate a higher bit error rate than a body of a message, such that they can be detected beyond a range at which a Bluetooth transmission normally would be corrupted (paragraph 1027). For this reason, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the DIAC of the instant application's disclosed prior art to contain the FEC value 114 of the combination of Haartsen and Ho.

Regarding claims 2-5, the receiver measures a performance parameter and sends information to the transmitter to change the user rate (coding rate) (Haartsen, paragraph 0017). The receiver will decode the following transmission at this new error correction-coding rate.

Regarding claim 6, the wireless communication system utilizes Bluetooth specifications for transmitting and receiving data (Haartsen, paragraph 0009).

Regarding claims 9, 26, 29 and 31, data transmitted following the Bluetooth specification has data comprising a digitally encoded data packet including an access code portion, a header portion and a payload portion.

Regarding claim 10, the describe link adaptation scheme of altering the coding rate described above may be used to automatically adjust communication link parameters to provide a desired range (paragraph 0058).

Regarding claims 11, 24 and 25, the FEC value 114 is received and indicates the level of coding for the FEC fields. This will show an increase, decrease or the same level of coding.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, a signal strength indicator is monitored in the receiver to determine if additional error correction coding is necessary (Haartsen, paragraph 0017) to increase the range of the transmission (paragraph 0058). A signal strength of zero would indicate the signal is not detected and a change to the error correction coding is necessary.

Regarding claim 15, symbols are re-encoded using the increased coding (Haartsen, paragraph 0042).

Regarding claims 19 and 20, the transmitting device searches for available receivers to receive the transmitted data.

Regarding claim 28, greater error correction coding capacity is included (Haartsen, paragraph 0041).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



Art Unit: 2631


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Burd whose telephone number is (571) 272-3008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin M. Burd  
11/28/2005

  
**KEVIN BURD**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**